

**SALT LAKE CITY**  
**HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the Meeting**  
**Room 326, 451 South State Street**  
**May 17, 2012**

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of the Historic Landmark Commission regular session meeting held on May 17, 2012.*

*Historic Landmark Commission Meetings are televised on SLCTV 17. Archived video of this meeting can be found at the following link under, "Historic Landmark Commission and RDA": [http://www.slctv.com/vid\\_demand.htm](http://www.slctv.com/vid_demand.htm),*

A regular meeting of the Historic Landmark Commission was called to order on Thursday, May 17, 2012, in Room 326 of the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, [5:33:28 PM](#) Commissioners present for the meeting were, Vice Chair Polly Hart, Earle Bevins III, Bill Davis, Arla Funk, Stephen James and Dave Richards. Chairperson Anne Oliver and Commissioner Sheleigh Harding were excused.

Planning Staff members present for the meeting were Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Thomas Irvin, Principal Planner; Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner; Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner; and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary. City Attorney Paul Neilson was also present.

**FIELD TRIP [5:33:39 PM](#)**

The Commissioner visited the following properties:

**153 North C Street-** Suggested 36" railing. Mr. Irvin explained the Applicant's optimal location for the fence. He explained the previous rail designs and Staff's recommendation with building code issues identified.

Commissioner Bevins asked for other examples or if a rail is allowed for Greek Revival.

Mr. Irvin had one example, where it doesn't block the front door. He said most porches on Greek Revival do not have railings characteristic to the style. Mr. Irvin stated the Applicant had dogs and would like to have a gate for them.

**400 South** – Ms. Pickering explained the Rumel house and reviewed the discussions with Kirk Huffaker (UHF) regarding a preservation easement. She stated Mr. Huffaker agreed with the rezone and they decided that TSA was the best.

Landmark site R/O Peak House to RMU-45 biggest difference. You can't build a big office building. Commissioner Hart asked what the height in RMU-45 was. Ms. Pickering said it was 45 feet. Why not zone for another zone? Commissioner Hart said it encouraged a tear down and she discussed how churches like to tear things down. Want to keep Village Inn site and parking lot into TSA, only properties to rezone east of 900 East.

**600 East Medians** – Option C is the preferred choice.

**DINNER** [5:33:47 PM](#)

Dinner was served to the Commission and Staff at 5:00 p.m. The Commission had no substantive business to discuss.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR** [5:34:05 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hart reviewed the meeting with the Planning Department Director, Wilford Sommerkorn, Assistant Planning Director, Cheri Coffey and Planning Manager, Joel Paterson. She stated they discussed the outstanding issues with the ordinance changes. Vice Chairperson Hart stated the City Council reviewed the ordinance and held a Public Hearing that was continued to future meetings. She reported that both she and Chairperson Oliver had received emails from a neighbor regarding the Wright Addition, that was postponed, and the comments were forwarded to Mr. Paterson.

**APPROVAL OF April 5, 2012 MINUTES** [5:35:53 PM](#)

**MOTION** [5:36:39 PM](#)

**Commissioner James moved to approve the minutes of April 5, 2012 with the corrections. Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**PUBLIC Comments** [5:37:01 PM](#)

No one wished to speak at this time.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS** [5:37:21 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hart stated case number PLNHLC 2012-00139 had been postponed.

[5:37:37 PM](#)

[5:37:37 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2012-00080 – Fournier Porch Railing – A request by Carmen Fournier for a wood porch railing on a single family residence located at 153 North C Street in the Avenues Historic District. The railing would fully enclose the existing elevated porch. The property is zoned RMF-35, Moderate Density Multifamily Residential District and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Thomas Irvin, 801-535-7932, or [thomas.irvin@slcgov.com](mailto:thomas.irvin@slcgov.com))**

Mr. Irvin reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). He stated Staff recommended the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the materials, building code and what was appropriate to be used for the porch. Staff stated that wrought Iron railings on porches of this period were not characteristic and informed the Commission that they could recommend a lower height for the railing.

The Commission and Staff discussed if gated porches that block views of the primary entrance were approved in the past. It was decided that gated porches configured in this manner have not been approved since they significantly change the view of the structure.

[5:45:58 PM](#)

Ms. Carmen Fournier, Applicant, stated they had originally planned to have a similar railing to match the current iron fence on the property. She read the guidelines for porch railings and stated that she felt proposed design met the requirements. Ms. Fournier stated that there are other Victorian houses in the area, similar to the subject house, with railings extending across the front entry. She submitted photos of the properties with these types of railings. Ms. Fournier said there are several reasons for the proposal, keeping her dogs in the yard and protecting them from traffic being a principal one. She stated the fence along the property would require extensive modification in order to provide the same result and would allow the dogs access into the garden areas which is not desired. Ms. Fournier expressed her willingness to improve and preserve her property.

Commissioner James asked if the Applicant had considered other ways of creating railings such as planter boxes etc.

Ms. Fournier explained that planter boxes would not provide the containment she was trying to achieve. She stated they considered a metal or wood railing that was not actually connected. Ms. Fournier stated the planter boxes would have to be quite high for safety purposes and would not enclose the front entrance.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the proposal and gate placement on the porch. The Commission stated the gate was an issue as it blocked the view of the entrance to the home and was against the standards.

The Applicant stated she would like to keep the dogs out of the yard areas as the home is known for its gardens. She explained that she wanted to preserve the integrity of her home and help improve the neighborhood by respecting the historic integrity.

[6:02:15 PM](#)

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Vice Chairperson Hart opened the Public Hearing. Seeing no one wished to speak to the issue, she closed the Public Hearing.

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner James inquired if the landing requirements applied to steps outside as well as inside structures.

Commissioner Richards stated he was under the impression that it was applied in both cases.

The Commissioners discussed the building code requirements and what solutions would be in compliance while still keeping within the character of the neighborhood and district. The Commission asked Staff if there had ever been a railing on the home in the past.

Mr. Irvin stated he was unable to find documentation or pictures indicating a railing had ever been in place. His research indicated that the porch was original to the home.

The Commission discussed other cases where railings were required per code. They discussed the height of the subject porch. The Commissioners stated they were in favor of the railing but not the gate. They discussed the space between the railings and the columns.

Commissioner James asked whether or not the railing would tie structurally to the column and if it could support the railing.

The Applicant stated yes it would be anchored to the column and was strong enough to support it.

**MOTION** [6:11:46 PM](#)

**Commissioner James stated based on the finding of the Staff report, the proposal failed to comply with the design guidelines of standard 2 section 21A.34.020G of the Zoning Ordinance and that the gate across the entryway was not approved.**

Mr. Paul Neilson, City Attorney, asked if the motion was to deny the proposal.

**Commissioner James stated that was correct.**

**Commissioner Funk seconded the motion.**

The Commissioners discussed whether to table the matter and allow the Applicant to work with Staff and return to the Commission for possible future approval.

**Commissioners James, Bevins, Funk voted *aye*. Commissioners Davis and Richards voted *nay*. The motion passed 3-2.**

Mr. Paterson explained why the application had been brought to the Commission and stated Staff could continue working with the Applicant on a solution which could potentially be approved administratively.

The Commissioners stated they did not want to require the Applicant to pay an application fee for a second review.

Vice Chairperson Hart read the appeal process regulations making a note that the Land Use Appeals Board was now an Appeals Hearing Officer.

[6:17:53 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2012-00147 - Landscaping the 600 East Medians from South Temple to 600 South- A request by Salt Lake City Parks and Public Lands Director, Emy Maloutas, to create low water use landscaping on the islands. The intent is to upgrade the irrigation system and replace existing turf with water-wise plant choices, preserving existing trees. The project is located in City Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Michaela Oktay at 801-535-6003 or [michaela.oktay@slcgov.com](mailto:michaela.oktay@slcgov.com))**

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report and the Public Comments received regarding the petition (both items are located in the Case

File). She stated Staff recommended approving “Option C” as it generally or substantially met the standards of the ordinance.

The Commissioners discussed the differences in turf type between what was proposed and what was currently in the medians.

Ms. Emy Maloutas, Public Lands Director, presented pictures of the proposed turf and explained the benefits of the turf versus what was currently in place. She reviewed the maintenance for the proposed turf and the savings from its implementation.

The Commissioners and the Applicant discussed the growth watering and maintenance needed to maintain the proposed turf. They discussed the labor costs incurred with the difference options and the savings with the proposal.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT [6:38:17 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Hart opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, resident, stated she owned property on 600 East and stated she agreed with the proposal as it was an improvement from the first proposal. Ms. Cromer stated “Option C “included a rock and she would like the Commission to take that out of the proposal as it was not part of the historic fabric of the medians.

Mr. J. Scott Anderson, resident, stated he was in opposition of the proposal and stated he would vote for the consistency and the simplicity of the appearance of grass.

Ms. Maloutas stated regarding the rock in the medians, staff put the rock there as trucks in the area were consistently driving over the island and the rock prevented a large muddy hole from forming in the area. She stated the proposal did not call for additional rocks to be added.

Vice Chairperson Hart closed the Public Hearing.

#### **[6:43:32 PM](#)**

#### **COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner James stated landscaping was an aspect that continually changed and he wondered if the Commission should have analyzed this project in the matter it had.

#### **[6:45:03 PM](#)**

#### **MOTION**

**Commissioner James stated based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented he moved to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness approving the repair of the irrigation system and conceptual plan C to replace modern turf with water wise alternatives on the 600 East medians as proposed. Commissioner Davis seconded the**

**motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Coffey stated in the draft Preservation Plan, Staff addressed this issue further to make it clear in the future and was proposing to have design guidelines for open space areas where this would fit in.

Vice Chairperson Hart read the appeal process.

[6:46:42 PM](#)

**PLNHLC2011-00604 - 1363 S Filmore Street Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Alterations – A request by Justin Lyons, Architect, for major alterations and a new garage at approximately 1363 S. Filmore Street. The request is for the approval of a rear yard addition on the home, and increasing the allowable height for a new garage. The property is located in the Westmoreland Historic District and the R-1/7,000 (Single-Family Residential) zoning district, in City Council District 5, represented by Jill Remington-Love. (Staff contact: Michaela Oktay, [michaela.oktay@slcgov.com](mailto:michaela.oktay@slcgov.com) )**

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommended approval of the petition with the conditions that any final building materials or other details be administratively reviewed before a certificate of appropriateness was issued.

Commissioner Richards asked if Staff was concerned about any specific details therefore, requiring Staff review.

Ms. Oktay stated there was no particular concern.

Vice Chairperson Hart reviewed the concern of a neighbor regarding a window on the garage.

Ms. Oktay reviewed the building code regarding windows, stated the windows would not be allowed and the design would need to be changed.

Commissioner Funk asked if the proposal were approved would the structure remain contributing to the historic district.

The Commissioners discussed the aspects of the proposal that would allow for the structure to remain contributing.

Staff explained if the proposal met the standards of the ordinance then the contributing status did not change. Staff stated the subject proposal was in compliance with the standards.





Mr. Justin Lyons, Designer, reviewed the proposal for the project, the amount of the addition that would be seen from the street, the setbacks and design for the garage. He explained the windows on the rear of the garage and on the side of the garage would be changed to meet the building code.

[7:06:12 PM](#)

#### **PUBLIC HEARING**

Vice Chairperson Hart opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cormer, resident, stated she was not in favor of the proposal as it would change a modest house into something that was too large for the property and would take away from the historic aspects of the home.

Mr. Jeff Van Minde, neighbor, the extra height of the garage would not be an issue as it would not be taller than his garage that was directly behind it. He stated there was an easement he wanted to make sure was kept as is. Mr. Minde asked if the trees on the property were going to be removed and if a fence was planned for the property.

Mr. Engeman stated the back easement would be addressed by putting the stairwell inside the garage.

Mr. Lyons stated they were only asking for eighteen inches which they felt would not be detrimental. He stated the trees would be removed where needed.

Mr. Engeman stated there were two large trees on the property that the City had directed him to remove. He told Mr. Minde he would be willing to work with him on the fence.

Mr. Paterson stated a fence was not part of the current proposal.

Commissioner James asked what would be done in place of the windows on the garage.

Mr. Lyons stated windows could be on the forward dormer. He stated there was a garage on the east side of the proposed garage which would block the line of site on that side. Mr. Lyons stated on the South side they would look into something to break up the wall.

The Commissioners agreed that Staff would work with the Applicant on solutions to this issue.

Vice Chairperson Hart closed the Public Hearing.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION [7:14:04 PM](#)

**MOTION** [7:14:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Richards stated in the case of PLNHLC2011-00604 the Commission finds that they concur with Staff's findings and approve the recommendation with final details and final building materials to be resolved by Staff administratively. Commissioner James seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:15:19 PM](#)

**PLNPCM2010-00647 - 400 South Livable Communities Station Area Plans** - A request by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker for an amendment to the Central Community Master Plan, Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map regarding transit station area plans along the 400 South transit corridor. The intent of the project is to implement livability goals for the corridor including land use policies and zoning that support mixed use development and transportation choices for current and future residents and workers. The Historic Landmark Commission will review and make a recommendation on the proposed zoning changes within the Central City Historic District. The project is located in City Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrett. (Staff contact: Maryann Pickering at 801-535-7660 or [maryann.pickering@slcgov.com](mailto:maryann.pickering@slcgov.com))

Ms. Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the Case File). She stated Staff recommended approval of the petition as presented.

The Commissioners discussed the color code on the maps and what was TSA and Historic Districts.

Commissioner James asked if the proposed setback was appropriate for the area. He stated it created gaps in the layout.

Ms. Pickering stated the proposal had been very well received by the public and explained the proposal was to help with the shadowing in the areas.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the layout of the area, the current development and the maximum footprint that could occur with the transition. Staff explained any proposal in the Historic District would be reviewed prior to being approved.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the step back design abutting residential areas that allowed for light, and where it applied in the proposed zone. Staff explained the area was specified within the Zoning Ordinance and was specifically in the RMF zoning district and some

of the RMU to protect those areas. The Commissioners asked if there was a commercial building behind a larger building would the same standard apply. Staff stated it would not apply. It was stated that if the idea was to promote a transit orientated development then from the stand point of a developer there was less leasable space.

Commissioner James stated there needed to be continuity on the street with no gaps.

Vice Chairperson Hart asked why and when the Historic District line adjustments had been taken out of the proposal.

Ms. Pickering stated the reason for the removal of the boundary change language, was because the temporary ordinance had been adopted by the City Council. She explained Staff needed to take the proposal to the City Council for action within the next few months. She stated Staff understood the importance and sensitivity of the Historic District therefore, in order for the proposal to move forward the language was removed. Ms. Pickering stated as a result of the last meeting Staff discussed and determined that because the survey for the Central City Historic District was not thorough or proper it needed to be redone, after which the boundaries could be reevaluated.

Vice Chairperson Hart asked if the Administration planned on coming back and asking to remove that portion of the Historic District.

Ms. Pickering stated it was her understanding that there was grant money that would be used to conduct the survey.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated, regarding the Peck house and the Ward house, she could not understand why the Administration would want to rezone the house to RMF-45 if they thought there was no intention of tearing it down. She asked why it would be up zoned if it would not be allowed to be demolished.

Ms. Coffey explained the proposal was actually a down zone from RO to RMF-45.

Vice Chairperson Hart asked what RO allowed.

Ms. Coffey explained it allowed residential and offices up to sixty feet high.

Ms. Pickering stated the rezone would change the subject area to RMU-45. She reviewed the changes on the map and explained it was an older district where primarily offices were

constructed. She explained there are always vacancies but because the offices would be allowed in the RMU Staff was trying to bring in the residential component because of the proximity to Trax.

Vice Chairperson Hart asked if there was a residential office zoning that was less than forty five feet or was that the minimum.

Ms. Coffey stated there was an RMU-35.

Vice Chairperson Hart asked why that was not chosen for the property.

Ms. Pickering stated Staff felt the 45 was more comparable to the transition zoning and because there is core right next to it making it more compatible.

The Commission discussed the zoning for the area and why it would not be good for the historic district. They stated it made sense to them to take it to the lowest zoning that still allowed for it to retain the commercial use.

Staff stated the structure had been used for offices in the past and was currently being used as an office.

The Commissioners asked if the Peck house property was part of the land that would be removed from the Historic District.

Ms. Pickering stated the Peck House was not currently within the Historic District it was registered as a City Landmark site.

Vice Chairperson asked why not rezone the ward house to what it is.

Ms. Coffey Stated it was zoned institutional. She stated places of worship are allowed in residential zones and the City did not usually zone properties institutional because it could be a fairly intense zone unless it was four acres or more. She explained the institutional zoning was more for hospitals, or places like the LDS Temple and the Cathedral of the Madeline. Ms. Coffey stated places for worship were allowed in many residential zones.

Vice Chairperson stated correct and her concern was not about allowing it to be used as an institution but was that the current structure could be demolished and something constructed under what the zoning allowed.

Ms. Coffey stated if it was rezoned to institutional it could become a much larger structure than what the current zoning allowed.

Commissioner Funk asked why Staff was not considering Historic Properties out of the Central City Historic District that were affected by the changes. She stated the proposal extends to 900 East and there were historic properties in the area that would be affected. Commissioner Funk stated she felt those properties needed to be addressed before the proposal was put in place. She asked if Gilgal gardens were within the proposed area.

Ms. Pickering stated Staff was proposing to rezone the garden to open space because it had residential zoning designation. She stated with the rezone to open space the garden would not be allowed to be developed.

Commissioner Funk stated she was concerned with backing the TOD zone to the property line of the garden.

Ms. Pickering stated any development around the open space would be required to have the proposed setbacks protecting the open space areas.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the open space areas and the shadow lines that became a problem in the garden areas.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the point system as outlined in the proposed development guidelines. They discussed the pros and cons of the new point system and how it would improve the overall process. The Commissioners and Staff discussed what other cities have done and how the process was reviewed. They reviewed the parking requirements as outlined in the proposal. Staff explained a future ordinance would address parking and outline the limits to parking in the proposed zone. They reviewed where parking was required and not required.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:53:42 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Hart opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judi Short, Resident, stated she was generally in favor of the proposal. She stated she agreed with conducting a survey and preserving the history of the area. Ms. Short spoke of the issues surrounding Gilgal Garden and what would happen if larger building were built around the open space. She asked the Commission to protect the historic fabric in the area.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, Resident, stated there were national register structures in the area as well as the Central City Historic District. She stated her suggestion would be to allow the transfer of development rights within a site. Ms. Cromer explained how that would work and explained there should be more points allotted for historic preservation as it was important for the City. She stated the Commission needed to address the point system before approving the proposal.

Mr. Robert Bliss, Resident, stated Gilgal Garden was a city park and it needed to be treated as such. He stated there was an importance in keeping open spaces as they were intended to be kept. Mr. Bliss stated he was disappointed in the architecture of the proposal and suggested having design competitions to help improve the quality of work done in Salt Lake City.

Ms. Pickering stated Ms. Short was correct in referring to the shadowing at Gilgal Garden but Staff felt the proposal adequately addressed the issue. She explained the problems with TDR and that they are typically used for agriculture land.

Commissioner Richards asked if there had been discussion regarding increasing setbacks around park areas.

Ms. Pickering explained the changes that lead up to adding open space in the current proposal.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the open space and the amount of historic properties affected by the TSA zoning. Staff stated, currently there were three or four historic properties in the area however, the survey needed to be complete for a clearer picture. The Commission asked if there was a way to require development around and in the historic area to be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission in order to get the points. Staff explained regardless of the point system, if a project of any significance was to be constructed in the Historic District it would be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission.

The Commissioners stated they were concerned that the Mayor would ask for the current Historic District to be removed in the next few months. They stated they wanted to ensure the Historic Landmark Commission had purview over any development surrounding a historic site. Staff stated they would look into whether or not that was a possibility and return with the information.

Vice Chairperson Hart closed the Public Hearing

#### **COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS** [8:09:57 PM](#)

The Commissioners made the following comments.

- The proposal would take away the historic urbanism of the area.
- Taking away the fabric of the area would be detrimental.

- A uniform development plan was needed to keep people thinking about what made the area great to start with.
- Open space and set backs are necessary to protect the gardens and parks that are in place.
- Should not let the Historic District be removed.
- TSA zoning will impact the remaining Historic District negatively.
- The center of the Central City Historic District does not have contributing structures.
- New point system has potential but needs to be fine tuned.
- Intention of the proposal was good but needed to be refined.

The Commissioners discussed the effects of the TSA zoning on the Historic Landmark Commissions' authority within the existing Historic District. Staff explained it did not change the overall authority of the Historic Landmark Commission or the requirement for Applicants to acquire approval for projects in the Historic District.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated she would like to know who was in favor of the petition and who was not in favor prior to a motion being made.

Commissioner James asked if the desired outcome was consistent and if the center part of the Historic District was not really relevant why the Historic Landmark Commission would worry about the development in the center of the Historic District.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated because the Commission should be commenting on how it was going to effect the existing Historic resources. She stated she did not think the Commission needed to be bothered with the rest of the 400 South zoning because it was not within the Commissions purview. Vice Chairperson Hart explained the TSA zoning would be the base zoning and the Historic District would be the overlay.

Commissioner James asked why the historic boundary review was being taken out of the proposal.

Mr. Paterson stated it was not being taken out of the proposal. He stated what the Commission was indicating was that at some point the City may look at modifying the Central City Historic District boundaries, which could take a portion of the corridor out of the Historic District. Mr. Paterson stated in the corridor that was proposed for TSA zoning, that goes through the Central City Historic District, basically between 500 South and 300 South and within those four blocks of the Historic District there are three of four contributing buildings combined.

Vice Chairperson Hart asked if all new construction would come to The Landmark Commission.

Mr. Paterson stated yes all new construction, all external modification required a certificate of appropriateness from Staff or to come to the Historic Landmark Commission for approval. He stated the City hears a number of complaints from business owners and property owners along 400 South regarding new development and that it is not historical in nature.

Commissioner Funk asked if rezoning could be approved without Historic Landmark Commission approval.

Mr. Paterson stated any boundary change or modification to the Historic District required the recommendation of the Historic Landmark Commission. He stated the subject proposal did not contain language regarding changing the historic district therefore, the base zone was being considered and brought to the HLC as a courtesy so Staff could gather comments on the base zoning and its impact on historic resources in the Historic District. Mr. Paterson stated the Historic Landmark Commission was not required to review the proposal however, by state law the Planning Commission was.

The Commission discussed who was ready to make a motion and who felt they had all the information they needed to make an appropriate recommendation on the proposal.

**MOTION [8:27:58 PM](#)**

**Commissioner James stated in regard to PLNPCM2010-00647, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission for the 400 South Livable Communities Master Plan and to encourage the Landmarks Commission to participate in the developments along the corridor in order to reinforce and strengthen the historic links that are currently between the northern and southern ends of the Central City Historic District**

Mr. Paul Neilson, City Attorney, asked for clarification on what was meant by the Landmark Commission participation.

Commissioner James stated through public process and review.

Mr. Neilson clarified maintaining the areas currently within the Historic District and preserving those with the H overlay district.



Commissioner James stated yes, so they are able to maintain traditional urbanism through the corridor.

**Commissioner Bevins seconded the motion.**

Commissioner James stated the Commission was fully anticipating participating in the review of new development through the corridor in order to strengthen the link between the north and south ends of the Central City Historic District.

Vice Chairperson Hart stated she thought what Commissioner James was saying was that he would like to maintain the current Historic District Boundaries.

Commissioner James stated that was correct and asked if the motion needed to be amended.

Mr. Neilson stated he felt Staff understood what was being asked and could forward the information.

The Commissioners discussed the lack of historic structures in the center of the Historic District and that the motion was in a sense pretending that there were historic materials present. They clarified that the motion was for a favorable recommendation for the TSA zone. The Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of the TSA zoning within the Historic District and how it would affect the future of the area.

[8:38:26 PM](#)

**The motion passed 3-2.**

Vice Chairperson Hart read the appeal process

#### **MOTION**

**Commissioner Funk moved in the case of PLNHLC2010-00674 that the Historic Landmark Commission recommend, specifically, that the City implement the survey to determine significant historic sites within the TSA zone and protect those individual historic sites with historic value and that the Historic Landmark Commission be given the purview to review the immediate surrounding developments. Commissioner James seconded the motion.**

Vice Chairperson Hart asked Commissioner Funk if she wished to included both A and B buildings.

Commissioner Funk stated yes both A and B buildings should be included.

Commissioner Davis questioned the validity of the motion since the Historic Landmark Commission all ready has purview over the area.

Commissioner Funk stated the point was that the Historic District may be removed and with that the historic buildings would go away.

Vice Chairperson Hart suggested amending the motion to include the language “should the district boundaries be changed”.

Mr. Paterson stated it was not Staff’s recommendation to eliminate the Historic District but to conduct a survey and consider the results prior to deciding what to do with the District.

Commissioner Funk stated that was understood but the properties needed to be protected.

[8:45:48 PM](#)

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**The meeting stood adjourned at [8:45:58 PM](#)**